

## Panel Discussion

### Opening Remarks from Professor Sakai Makiko

“In Africa, land was originally prevented from being freely bought and sold. But as this resource now comes to be governed by the logic of the market, the issue of how to secure the rights and livelihood of small scale farmers and ranchers has come to the fore. There was a time when these groups in Africa could ignore the framework of the nation and live without any direct contact with state authorities. However, the issue of how to negotiate with governments have become a problem for these farmers and ranchers. From this perspective, Professor Takeuchi demonstrated how we see politicians [in Africa] governing based on dominant trends in international affairs; in contrast, Professor Sato showed how party politics in India are extremely functional [for local actors]. This possibility of a platform for dialogue [between local actors and the state] is surely something that we can learn much from.

Moving on to Professor Hataya’s presentation, we see that as Colombia struggles to usher in a new era as it transitions from a state of civil war to peace following the [2016 peace treaty with the FARC], there are also concerns brought on by the issue of mineral resources, the trend towards commercial farming, and the unchecked influx of foreign investment. Across all of the presentations, we have a few common threads. These include: how to effect a relation to the land that prioritizes the values of various local actors instead of the logic of the market; how to communicate the value of things that cannot be calculated in cash; and how to reflect such priorities in the political realm. Now, I would like to hear the presenters’ thoughts on the differences among the regions discussed today. In particular, I hope to hear your thoughts concerning the potential of creating institutions that can communicate [the needs of local actors] to state authorities.”

### Professor Takeuchi’s Response (Three Points)

“First, I’d like to discuss the issue of land rent. In Africa today, there is a steady progression of farmland enclosures. In other words, there is a real sense that land rent is growing force in Africa. In Zambia, for example, the purchase of farmland by urban residents is the driving force behind farmland enclosure. Because Zambia has a weak social safety net, these urban residents view the acquisition of farmland as a guaranteed source of income in old age. To the salaried urban resident, farmland is an incredibly cheap commodity. Thus, when such individuals purchase land with cash, ownership rights over the land in question become clearly delineated [allowing for enclosure]. This is my first point. That is, we must recognize the importance of land rent.

My second point concerns enclosures. Although enclosure is proceeding at an extremely rapid pace, we cannot really say that villagers are being expelled from their places of residence [at a commensurate pace]. While land is being rapidly subject to enclosure in Africa, we do not yet see a fierce conflict [between villagers and city dwellers], making for a complex situation. On the other hand, although there have been cases where land titles have been granted, those that have been granted have been politicized; the current administration, as well as land title-granting localities, have issued land titles with no concrete owners. Such titles are easily subject to change based on individual circumstances, leading to instability.

If we speak in terms of primitive accumulation, it is normal to see an outside power forcibly expropriating land, then being granted legal title to this theft. However, those land titles that have been recognized at the political level in Africa lose their validity when the country experiences regime change. Such instances of political change have been common in African history. In my opinion, it is important to pay attention to this fact and how it influences events to come. In other words, this is a crucial dimension to consider for scholars in regional studies.

As for my third point, with regards to India, Professor Sato Hiroshi has discussed the policy differences of two regimes, and that these policy differences can be understood within the framework of neoliberalism. I find this point very suggestive, and agree that we can view things in this way. For example, in the former Bantustan of South Africa, there was no system of private land ownership, only an indirect form of ownership. However, following the abolition of apartheid, these Bantustan were reintegrated into South Africa. During this process of reintegration, there was a great deal of discussion in South Africa over how to deal with the administration of the land in the former Bantustan. Eventually, though the state did not establish any concrete policy, it was decided to vigorously prevent the intrusion of foreign capital into the former Bantustan. The experience of apartheid – and the expropriation of land from native black Africans that came with it – was still fresh in the minds of South Africans, and so the government did not take up any policies for foreign investment in those Bantustan areas. But the experience of other countries has been different – for instance, Mozambique is a nation that energetically introduced foreign investments. Furthermore, there are differences in land policy within the same nation. In Ethiopia, for example, policy differs markedly between land of high and low value. Considering this situation, I believe it is essential to consider state policy regarding land.”

#### Professor Hataya Noriko Responds to Professor Sakai

“First, regarding the peace process and politics of Colombia, it is not accurate to say that Colombia has been in a constant state of civil war, nor that the new peace treaty has opened up a chance to build a new Colombia. Compared to other countries in Latin America, Colombia has had remarkably stable and fixed democratic institutions. But this political establishment is extremely exclusionary, and there is little chance for the emergence of political parties representing populism or leftism. The peace process itself is in a precarious position in the current political climate. Two years ago, when the peace proposal was put up to a popular vote, it failed. This was a result that shocked even those outside of Colombia, and a compromise measure was pushed through. Therefore, while we cannot say that everyone does not want peace, the struggle over the peace process is wrapped up in the political battles between President Santos and members of the previous administration. Additionally, this year (2018) is a presidential election year, and matters of land policy like that discussed earlier remain in the balance, and we cannot say how things will develop. Essentially, things are very precarious now.

Regarding the possibility of non-market values; Colombia is a nation where a neoliberal and pro-US faction have achieved dominance in politics. Therefore, while areas like the Reserve Zones or special grants to ethnic minorities have been protected by the government, such policies were the products of compromise. Currently, there is no move to reconsider going beyond the already-established areas. As peace progresses, we are likely to see an increase in foreign investment in Colombia. The protected areas, guaranteed to the farmers despite bitter feelings and stigmatism from the government, are not going to be

expanded, according to the current administration. Should large scale development begin, the government will draw from neoliberal designs, and advance development along their desired path. There is also suggested revision to the law. Now, there are alternative models of development not based on market principles, and I'd like to draw attention to these. One more issue is that, local initiatives for development are dispersed across the country; at the same time, we have movements have arisen to accept former guerrillas who are returning to society. There is friction between movements from below and the kind of order planted from the top down by the government. There are things we should pay attention to in the movements for alternative development, but there will certainly continue to be conflict with the official government policies."

#### Professor Sato Hiroshi Gives His Comments

"While I do not have a high opinion of democracy in India, I feel myself in a rather strange dilemma as I speak about Indian democracy. Now, regarding the issue of political parties staking opposite positions on the question of land, the parties are being pushed in this direction by outside forces. For example, NGOs and so-called social movements are particularly active in India, producing a multiplicity of opinions on the land issue, and the political parties have no choice but to reflect these interests. If party politics can be seen to have a degree of democracy, one reason is the strength of actors outside of the political parties. If we suppose that the parties were truly democratic and created policies that reflect the demands of the people, then surely we would see the debates over land policy taking place entirely within the realm of party politics. We have a politics base on vested interests, though during the previous regime we saw the beginnings of democratic politics, and we are now seeing a real impact of these democratic sprouts. There are the law of public information and initiatives against unemployment. Without these policies, it is impossible to speak of politics in India today. In the past, members of social movements helped to craft government policies as advisers. For that reason, when we think of Indian democracy, it should be within a large framework that considers these non-party actors in addition to the political parties.

Additionally, I'd like to offer the following three points. First, relating to the land reforms mentioned in Professor Takeuchi's presentation – well, these three points actually come from thinking of comparisons between Africa and India – regarding land reform, in the case of India, in the 1960s – well that is to say the reforms up to the early 70s – these reforms were actually land redistribution and tenancy reforms, whereas in case of Africa, the problem is to newly settle the landholding rights upon (individual) owners. Can we not suppose that such landholding rights were originally intended for making land a marketable commodity? This is because it would be impossible to commodify land and dispossess the original users without such landholding rights.

My next point deals with the establishment of these rights. This is an enormous issue in India, and I will offer one example using the land ownership of forests. The state has assumed total ownership over all forests, though this system was established at the same time as that for land rights. When we consider this issue in India with Africa in mind, it presents an extremely interesting opportunity for reflection. There are many more issues with effect both Africa and India, and one of them is the problem of Indians in Africa. In both eastern and southern Africa, seventy to eighty percent of migrants from India come from Gujarat. Those from Gujarat make up a sizeable portion of those Indians who actively mediate relations between India and Africa. Meanwhile, it is in Gujarat that we see the most enthusiasm amongst those who

effect cooperation programs at the government level.

Additionally, within the India–Africa cooperation, the current involvement of Japan is of great importance. As a growing sense of resistance to the influence of China develops amongst India and Africa, India does not desire to go it alone, but rather seeks partnership with Japan. This trend began with Mozambique. From Mozambique to Zambia, and then with Gambia, we have a joint India–Japan Africa project. Therefore, rather than speaking of the two nations of India and Mozambique, what is occurring in Africa now can be said to be a conflict over market penetration across several countries in Africa. This is how China enters the picture. Whenever India makes any kind of commitment to Africa, it must necessarily involve Japan acting in partnership.”

#### Professor Tomotsune Gives the Following Comments

“To give my broad impressions, I am reminded of Benedict Anderson’s work in *Imagined Communities*. When we think of global capitalism, our impression is often that of the developed nations of the OECD acting as the driving force of the global financial market, spreading neoliberal development out to the rest of the world without regard for mercy or humanity. However, in actuality it is local forces that act as the conduit for global finance and allow capital to penetrate into, and reorganize, localities across the globe. In other words, we must correct our image of global capitalism. One helpful suggestion in this direction is found in Professor Nakayama’s “three scales:” global space, urban space, and the nation state. If we could perhaps have a more vivid explanation of this model, no doubt there is possibility that we will revise our image of global capitalism.

Next, I’d like to discuss Professor Gluck’s presentation. What was suggestive about this presentation, which started with interviews with individuals from Lesotho, is the question of who is sustaining modernity? The questions of whose voice, whose ideas are supporting modernity. Moreover, the issue of realizing modernity through various approaches and through one’s internal desires. In a concrete way, these are realized through a local power. Realized through legal revisions and institutionalization. If we think in this way, laws for the revision of land policy reveal the different faces of modernity. Modernity, land reform, and rent-based capitalism has many different facets with the same configuration.

Building on that, one thing that I’d like to ask Professor Haraguchi is, regarding the recognition of land and space, can we think of the phenomenon seen in Osaka as the same as that in Africa, India, and Colombia? In particular, in whichever country, in whichever region, local power holders play an enormous role. How should we understand the nature of this kind of power in Osaka? How should we think of the role of the Osaka city government? Additionally, you mentioned in your presentation that Osaka is really two places, the north and the south. In the north we have Minami, in the south Kamagasaki. This reflects class divisions. How is this class hierarchy reflected in the local authorities?

Regarding Professor Nakayama’s point, to put it simply, this is uneven development, and not modernity. The relative intensity of uneven development may be different, but I think the answer may be found in the approach of Professor Gluck, which is comprehensive, all-inclusive. At the end of Professor Gluck’s presentation, she mentioned that “Modernity is inhuman. However, modernity contains within it the potential to turn the inhuman into the human.” In contrast, uneven development does not contain this possibility. Or, at least we can think that preestablished harmony is not possible. If we can think of the answer as lying here, then the true resolution is not to be found within uneven development.”

## Professor Haraguchi Responds

“First, I’d like to focus on the many keywords we’ve been using. An ill-disposition towards neoliberalism – that is to say the process by which the dispossession of land is actually realized – is the broad premise, and we can get inspiration from the various points we share. Here, through the experiences of African countries and others, when we once more examine the state of affairs in Osaka, it becomes clear that there are various forces at work effecting dispossession here as elsewhere. At the end of my presentation I mentioned the phrase “accumulation by dispossession” (a phrase comes from David Harvey’s 2003 book), but this concept comes from Marx’s idea of ‘primitive accumulation.’ Now, the ‘primitive’ in primitive accumulation refers to the process of accumulation that occurred before the age of capitalist production. Harvey uses ‘accumulation by dispossession’ because we actually see this process of capital accumulation occurring over and over again in the course of the history of capitalism, in particular in urban centers, and not only in the prehistory of capitalism.

Since the 1980s, in the age of neoliberalism, this process of capital accumulation has swelled enormously. There have been a number of empirical studies in the field of urban studies, showing how this process has occurred in places like New York and London, and many new studies are progressing now with this viewpoint in mind. Here I’d like to make some key points. First, there is a shared understanding of the problem of neoliberalism and its prioritization of market values. But whatever the region, to enact neoliberal policies, local elites are essential. If we take this view, it becomes clear that the market cannot function without the coordination of local elites. Now, there are cases when primitive accumulation occurs with great violence, and also cases where it proceeds smoothly. That is to say, because there are cases of eviction only with intense, violent struggle and cases where there is relatively little eviction, we must examine all the various possibilities of this process.

Moving on, there is one more important point I’d like to make, this one involving the cooperation between state and public corporations, particularly with TPP under the Hashimoto government in Osaka. We’ve seen many overbearing performances online and in the media, but there is another technique they use to actualize their policies, which is to request policy proposals, and then execute them with state power.

For my next point, I would like to think about the issue of class. When we speak of neoliberalism, generally we begin with the principles of the market, but as David Harvey has made clear neoliberalism is also the ‘restructuring of society with class power by large corporations, and in particular finance capital.’ This is to say, the class power that had dominated up to the 1970s based on Fordist model of production had stagnated. Through trial and error we have arrived at a new era of class dominance, and it is with this in mind that we should consider issues of land, power, and capital. With this in mind, I’d like us to pay attention to the fact that, while it is normal to not leave out industrial production and factories when we discuss cities, in today’s presentation, such topics did not come up. We’re speaking of agriculture, industry, and land, but we are in a situation where factories do not enter into our discussion. I believe this is the situation in Africa, and in Osaka, a city which is supposed to be an industrial city, yet where factories no longer hold any meaning. Instead, the current trend is debating whether or not to invite casinos into Osaka. Following this trend of commonality, it is possible to see how the shape of global capital has shifted from the dominance of industrial capital to finance capital.”

Professor Nakayama's Response

"I agree with Professor Haraguchi's assessment that what matters is not within the factory anymore. In the realm of global development, international agriculture has shifted its form, and craftsmanship has been overwhelmingly deteriorating. That is to say, we have an industry that is premised on the enjoyment of wealth instead of the production of things to satisfy the needs of humanity. However, at the same time, international agriculture has shifted its form into a kind of industry, and the logic of industry has escaped from the factory and mingled with the realm of living things. By which I mean, industry gone beyond the area of factory, but affects the human body and other life – e.g., we can grow plants without natural light and combat food crises, and in the field of DNA we are almost recreating human beings. Industry has begun to target humanity itself, and so does not need to be in factories; we now see the logic of industry advance across all segments of life. Human beings have become raw material. There are many possible directions when the topic of factories comes up.

Regarding the comments about the relationship between modernity and uneven development, I was convinced by the first half of Prof. Gluck's lecture, but was disappointed in her discussion of "making the inhuman human." Being human or humanity itself is one of the main ideals of modern West, hence it is nothing more than reverting to the long-held standards of the West to have high expectation for this concept. Besides, it means to once more render invisible a history of incalculable violence done in the name of "humanity", like the case of humanitarian intervention. However, regarding the question of how to take over the heritage of modernity, though this was not a point that has come up yet in our discussion today, I would like to indicate the importance of "recognition" and "consciousness" or knowledge, different from mere information. Or, to use Professor Tomotsune's concept of "impossibility," though we are brought to despair when we recognize the impossibility to get out of uneven development which includes some while expelling them in other sense and which goes in hand in hand with differentiation as well as with identification at the same time, we can still find some hope in our 'consciousness' of partiality. Alternative ideals cannot always get enough power because they tend to be seen as a different kind of ideology, which then does not contribute to conflicting reality. Still, we do have hope for the power of modernity to keep room for partial and regional knowledge, including Western one this time."

Questions from the Floor

In the final section, we took comments from the audience. These were: concerning Africa, how can farmers use their own energies to raise the productivity of their own land; how can they achieve a sustainable existence. Additionally, regarding the complex systems of land administration in Africa, how can this be changed for the better, with a particular regard to the potential of SDGs (sustainable development goals). Finally, how can we draw on Japan's experience of land tax reform?

Professor Takeuchi's Response

"First, today's discussion is relevant to almost all of the seventeen objectives of the SDGs. In particular, in discussions surrounding SDGs, the sixteenth point of "governance" is often overlooked. In such cases, I believe it is essential that while planning for the rule of law and political stability, we also strive for growth which reduces poverty. Based on the shape growth takes, it can lead to stress on the social system, resulting in struggles.



Next, to speak of the expropriation of land in Zimbabwe, when considering the background of why the Mugabe regime initiated such policies of expropriation, one factor was the end of promised aid from the Blair administration, and that land reforms had not progressed in the slightest. South Africa was suffering in a similar predicament, and there, most of the land, especially the land of highest quality, was in the hands of whites. Black Africans had been robbed of this land during the history of colonialism, and were left with an extremely small amount of land to live on. The government promised to return this land that had been usurped by the whites, and yet because they could not just unilaterally seize possession of this land, the government took up a policy of buying land from those willing to sell and selling it to those able to buy. For this reason, there was no progression in the turnover of land.

With this situation in the background, arguments that land seizure should progress more vigorously have some strength in contemporary South Africa. Should such policies be enacted, it is likely that black Africans will be able to produce more due to the simple fact that they have more land, as we have seen in Zimbabwe. However, the political cost that comes with such an initiative is high, and it also leads to international friction. Therefore, if we consider the totality of the situation, these policies produce a negative result.

As the case of Zimbabwe illustrates, we cannot simply move from large plantations held by whites to small scale farms held by black Africans. So, what is the most desirable system of land administration? Africa is currently facing an issue where it does not have enough food to sustain itself. This is a fundamental issue, and in the background, there is widespread enclosure of farmland. Some of these enclosures are to support production for foreign export, and some is for the domestic market. In other words, we have enclosure to support bioengineering, which entails export to developed nations, and enclosure for agricultural production to support the various countries' urban populations. The latter is particularly important for a nation's economic development. On the other hand, the very real problem of insufficient calories continues to this day. Thus, how to raise productivity, and moreover, how to raise it to a level sufficient to end the state of precarious existence of many Africans. How can we provide fertilizer and high-quality seeds in sufficient quantities? These are the real, practical questions we must consider. Recently, there have been discussions regarding the possibility of introducing a system of raising productivity by providing fertilizer and seed through contracts while also preserving farmers' hold on the land. I believe it is possible to raise the productivity of farmland without the rapid consolidation of large plantations based on mechanized agriculture."

#### Professor Sato Gives the Following Remarks Regarding Land Tax Reform

"The land system developed in India under British control took shape from the late eighteenth to the mid-nineteenth century. So, there is no clear comparison with Japan. However, we can say that the land administration of Taiwan and Korea under Japanese control was clearly based on the system the British established in India. There are reports of surveys on British land administration in India within the document collections of the governor generals of Taiwan and Korea."

#### Professor Tomotsune Gives the Closing Remarks

"The issues discussed today have a practical importance and urgency for policy making, and are not just theoretical. Through the connections brought about by future Africa/Japan research and Japanese

language education in Africa, we must share a sense of importance and urgency surrounding the issues discussed today. Therefore, we must have international symposiums that take a different form from academic conferences.

Finally, both Professor Sakai and I would like to expressive our gratitude to all the presenters and attendees. It has been a great opportunity for the Institute of Japan Studies as well as the newly-established African Studies Center to hold this symposium. Today, we have heard presentations that have reinterpreted our understanding of modernity through considerations of pressing issues like land reform, as well as various other topics including contemporary Osaka. Thank you.”

edited by T. Tomotsune (TUFS)  
translated by Michael Abele (Harvard University)